

## SUBCONTRACT CONSENT REVIEW CHECKLIST

### A. Identification

Name of Contractor and Contract No.

Dollar Amount

Name of Subcontractor and Subcontractor No.

Dollar Amount

Date of request for consent:

Date received:

### B. General

1. The subcontract consent package was submitted timely.  
( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
2. An adequate description of the supplies, equipment, or services was provided and the selection of these particular items is technically justified.  
( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
3. The contractor has adequately and reasonably translated prime contract technical requirements into subcontract requirements.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
4. Adequate consideration has been obtained for the use of Government-furnished facilities.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
5. Is the subcontract for special test equipment or facilities that are available from Government sources?  
( ) N/A, ( ) No, ( ) Yes, explain.
6. The contractor has adequately assessed and disposed of the subcontractor's alternate proposals, if offered.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
7. A copy of the proposed subcontract was provided.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
8. The contractor has adequately implemented the requirements of applicable labor acts (See FAR Part 22).  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
9. The proposed subcontract delivery/completion requirements are reasonable.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
10. The procurement was processed effectively, efficiently, expeditiously, and economically.  
( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
11. The procurement was reviewed by and/or had the involvement of contractor's Quality Assurance staff.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.

**C. Source Selection**

1. The proposed subcontractor was identified.  
( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
2. Make-or-buy considerations have been adequately addressed.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
3. Procurement is not from a contractor-controlled source; or if from a contractor-controlled source, adequate justification was provided.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
4. A convincing explanation of why and how the proposed subcontractor was selected including the degree of competition obtained was provided.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
5. The contractor considered soliciting labor surplus area and small business sources, including small businesses owned and controlled by disadvantaged individuals.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
6. The contractor has complied with the prime contract requirements regarding labor surplus area or small business subcontracting, including, if applicable, its plan for subcontracting with small business concerns, small business concerns owned and controlled by disadvantaged individuals, veteran-owned, service-disabled veteran-owned, HUBZone, and women-owned small businesses.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
7. The contractor has complied with the prime contract requirements regarding purchases from nonprofit agencies designated by the Committee for Purchase from People who are Blind or Severely Disabled (Javits-Wagner-O-Day Act (JWOD) (41 U.S.C. 48) (See Part 8).  
( ) N/A ( ) Yes ( ) No
8. The contractor agreed to provide progress payments on fixed-price subcontracts with small business concerns in conformity with FAR 32.5 and not to consider such payments as an adverse factor in selection.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
9. The contractor has a sound basis for determining the responsibility of the particular subcontractor.  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
10. The proposed subcontractor's name appears on the lists of debarred, suspended, and ineligible bidders (See FAR 9.404).  
( ) N/A, ( ) No, ( ) Yes, explain.
11. A foreign ownership, control, or influence (FOCI) determination has been made (See DEAR 904.704).  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
12. An organizational conflicts of interest (OCI) analysis has been performed (See DEAR 909.504).  
( ) N/A, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.
13. A preaward equal opportunity compliance review has been performed within six months of the estimated award date and a determination has been made that the subcontractor is awardable (FAR-22.8).  
( ) N/A, subcontract is for less than \$1 million, ( ) Yes, ( ) No, explain.

**D. Flow Down Representations and Certifications**

The required subcontractor representations and certifications were obtained or are not applicable (see DEAR 952.215-70).  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.

**E. Clauses**

1. The clauses, which are required to be incorporated in subcontracts, were adequately flowed down.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.
2. The following clauses were adequately handled.
  - a. Changes ☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.
  - b. Termination ☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.
  - c. Government Property ☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.
  - d. Cost Accounting Standards ☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.
3. All other clauses appeared to be appropriate.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.

**F. Type of Subcontract**

1. The proposed subcontract is firm-fixed-price or an adequate justification for using another type of contract was provided; it is not a cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost subcontract.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.
2. If incentives are proposed, an adequate explanation of the incentive fee/profit plan, management decisions used to quantify each incentive element, and a brief summary of trade-off possibilities was provided.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.

**G. Price/Cost Justification**

1. The proposed price/cost was adequately analyzed and justified as being fair and reasonable on the following basis(es):  
☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.  
  
☐ Price analysis; comparison with  
☐ Cost Analysis.  
  
☐ See Remarks.
2. The proposed profit/fee was adequately analyzed and justified as being fair and reasonable.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.

**H. Memorandum of Negotiations**

1. An adequate memorandum of negotiations which sets forth the principal elements of the subcontract negotiation was submitted.

☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.

2. Accurate, complete, and current cost or pricing data were obtained or an adequate reason for not obtaining these data was submitted.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.
3. A properly executed Certificate of Current Cost or Pricing Data was obtained.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.
4. If certified cost or pricing data were submitted, the extent to which reliance was not placed on said data is adequately set forth.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.
5. The memorandum of negotiation adequately sets forth the action taken by the prime contractor and the subcontractor if it was recognized in the negotiation that any cost or pricing data submitted was not accurate, complete, or current.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.
6. Where the total price/cost negotiated differs significantly from the contractor's total price/cost objective, the difference is adequately explained.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.
7. The contractor has complied with cost accounting standards requirements for awarding subcontracts.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.

**I. Third-Party Participants**

The concurrence of third party participants has been obtained.  
☐ N/A, ☐ Yes, ☐ No, explain.

**J. Recommendation of Contract Specialist**

- ☐ The subcontract consent package submitted is adequate and Contracting Officer consent to the proposed subcontract is recommended:
- ☐ without conditions or comments.
  - ☐ with conditions.
  - ☐ with comments.
- ☐ The subcontract consent package is not adequate and sending a letter of non-concurrence is recommended.

---

(Contract Specialist Signature)

(Date)

**K. Explanations/Remarks/Conditions/Comments (Attach additional pages if necessary).**